



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/529,561

05/27/2005

Yonatan Silver

94027

9146

24628 7590 08/05/2008

Husch Blackwell Sanders, LLP

Welsh & Katz

120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA

22ND FLOOR

CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

SAINT CYR, JEAN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/05/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/529,561	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SILVER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JEAN D. SAINT CYR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 83-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-82 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 May 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 83-90, filed 05/27/2005, are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 83, 85-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dagtas et al in view of Crosby et al, US No. 5933192.

Re claim 83, Dagtas et al disclose an anticipatory processing system for smoothing transition between different views of an event in a program, the program being received in program transmissions from a Headend, the views being imaged by a plurality of cameras (see fig.2, a plurality of cameras), the cameras providing a plurality of images of the views (along with the different camera views, 0014), the system comprising:

at least one audio/video processor to: receive the program transmissions from the Headend (the processor 420 can retrieve the information from the network. It should be noted that each distributed processor that makes up processor 420 generally contains its own addressable memory space, 0063) and prepare the

Art Unit: 2623

images of one of the views for rendering (selects camera view 225 and displays this in location 371 on display 370, 0058).

; and

a controller to: generate a prediction of which one of the views needs to be displayed next after a current one of the views; and control the at least one audio/video processor (View controller 350 has a different user preferences 355. Tracking user preferences 360 indicates that this user wants to see Player1 and, if Player1 cannot be shown, Player2. In this example, Player1 is player 210 of FIG. 2, so there are three cameras 220, 225, and 230 that have views of player 210.,0058; by using user preferences it will be easier to move from one view to another view of the camera);

But Dagtas et al did not explicitly disclose wherein the at least one audio/video processor is operative to begin processing images of the predicted view while the images of the current view are still being displayed, so that when the change from displaying the current view to the predicted view is executed, the transition between the current view and the predicted view is smooth.

However, Crosby et al disclose by predicting the next channel and causing one of the tuner modules 22 or 24 to begin tuning to that predicted next channel before a new channel is requested, the microcontroller 70 can enable the receiver 10 to process a repeated or correctly-predicted channel-change command much more quickly than a conventional receiver can in Col.5, lines 60-65.

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to combine the system of Dagtas with the system of Crosby for the benefit of having a system responding more accurately to the requests of the users.

Re claim 84, Dagtas et al did not explicitly disclose wherein the different views are transmitted from the Headend via different channels, so that the current view is associated with a first one of the channels and the predicted view is associated with a second one of the channels, the at least one audio/video processor being operative to begin processing the second channel while the first channel is still being displayed, so that when the change from displaying the first channel to the second channel is executed, the transition between the first channel and the second channel is smooth.

However, Mathews et al disclose it is noted that the virtual channel selector 74 changes the virtual channel without affecting the primary channel number "20" being shown on the primary channel number display 72. In this manner, the change of camera viewpoints is transparent to the viewer. The viewer believes that he/she is still watching the sports network on channel "20", even though the set-top box is switching among multiple channels all the time in column 5, lines 47-54; that means camera views was transmitted in different channels.

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the invention of Dagtas with the invention of Mathews for the purpose of giving more opportunities to users.

Also, Crosby et al disclose Upon predicting the next channel to be selected, the microcontroller causes the second tuner module to begin tuning to that predicted next channel, col.2, lines 19-21; While one channel is being processed for use, a microcontroller predicts the next channel likely to be selected and causes the tuning unit to begin tuning to that predicted next channel in col.1, lines 64-67; Since the receiver begins tuning to the predicted next channel even before a new channel is requested, an expected channel-change command can be processed more quickly than in a conventional receiver, see abstract.

Art Unit: 2623

It would have obvious to combine the invention of Dagtas with the invention of the invention of Crosby for the benefit of having a system capable of making prediction more accurately whenever cameras viewpoints are transmitted in different channels.

Re claim 85, Dagtas et al did not disclose wherein the controller is operative to generate the prediction of the predicted view based on a prediction of a future user input.

However, Crosby et al disclose While one channel is being processed for use, a microcontroller predicts the next channel likely to be selected and causes the tuning unit to begin tuning to that predicted next channel, col.1, lines 64-67.

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to combine the system of Dagtas with the system of Crosby for the benefit of having a system responding more accurately to the requests of the users.

Re claim 86, Dagtas et al disclose wherein the controller is operative to generate the prediction of the predicted view based on data of at least one possible path that a user can take from one of the cameras to at least another one of the cameras (the voting system can vote based on which camera view will be closest to the previously selected camera view, 0032).

Re claim 87, Dagtas et al disclose wherein data of the at least one possible path is received via the transmissions from the Headend (the transmitter is usually a better place at which the object tracking and statistical determinations may be performed, 0031; that means information received from the head end may be used).

Re claim 88, Dagtas et al disclose wherein the controller is operative to generate the prediction of the predicted view based on tracking an object selected for tracking by a user(see fig.1, object tracking?; a method 100 is shown for tracking objects in sports programs and selecting an appropriate camera view, 0016).

Re claim 89, Dagtas et al disclose a method for smoothing transition between different views of an event in a program, the views being imaged by a plurality of cameras(see fig.2, plurality of cameras), the cameras providing a plurality of images of the views(a transmitter collects this information from the available camera views. The transmitter packages tracking information and statistics and sends this data to users, along with the different camera views, 0014), the method comprising:

receiving the program in program transmissions from a Headend (a transmitter collects this information from the available camera views. The transmitter packages tracking information and statistics and sends this data to users, along with the different camera views, 0014; that means receiving data from headend);

preparing the images of one of the views for rendering(selects camera view 225 and displays this in location 371 on display 370, 0058);

generating a prediction of which one of the views needs to be displayed next after a current one of the views (View controller 350 has a different user preferences 355. Tracking user preferences 360 indicates that this user wants to see Player1 and, if Player1 cannot be shown, Player2. In this example, Player1 is player 210 of FIG. 2, so there are three cameras 220, 225, and 230 that have

Art Unit: 2623

views of player 210.,0058; by using user preferences it will be easier to move from one view to another view of the camera); and

But Dagtas did not explicitly disclose beginning processing images of the predicted view while the images of the current view are still being displayed, so that when the change from displaying the current view to the predicted view is executed, the transition between the current view and the predicted view is smooth.

However, Crosby et al disclose by predicting the next channel and causing one of the tuner modules 22 or 24 to begin tuning to that predicted next channel before a new channel is requested, the microcontroller 70 can enable the receiver 10 to process a repeated or correctly-predicted channel-change command much more quickly than a conventional receiver can in Col.5, lines 60-65.

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to combine the system of Dagtas with the system of Crosby for the benefit of having a system responding more accurately to the request of the users.

Re claim 90, see rejection on claim 89.

Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dagtas et al in view of Crosby further in view of Mathews et al, US No. 5600368.

Re claim 84, Dagtas et al did not explicitly disclose wherein the different views are transmitted from the Headend via different channels, so that the current view is associated with a first one of the channels and the predicted view is associated with a second one of the channels, the at least one



Art Unit: 2623

audio/video processor being operative to begin processing the second channel while the first channel is still being displayed, so that when the change from displaying the first channel to the second channel is executed, the transition between the first channel and the second channel is smooth.

However, Mathews et al disclose it is noted that the virtual channel selector 74 changes the virtual channel without affecting the primary channel number "20" being shown on the primary channel number display 72. In this manner, the change of camera viewpoints is transparent to the viewer. The viewer believes that he/she is still watching the sports network on channel "20", even though the set-top box is switching among multiple channels all the time in column 5, lines 47-54; that means camera views was transmitted in different channels.

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the invention of Dagtas with the invention of Mathews for the purpose of giving more opportunities to users.

Also, Crosby et al disclose Upon predicting the next channel to be selected, the microcontroller causes the second tuner module to begin tuning to that predicted next channel, col.2, lines 19-21; While one channel is being processed for use, a microcontroller predicts the next channel likely to be selected and causes the tuning unit to begin tuning to that predicted next channel in col.1, lines 64-67; Since the receiver begins tuning to the predicted next channel even before a new channel is requested, an expected channel-change command can be processed more quickly than in a conventional receiver, see abstract.

It would have obvious to combine the invention of Dagtas with the invention of the invention of Crosby for the benefit of having a system capable of making prediction more accurately whenever cameras viewpoints are transmitted in different channels.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean Duclos Saintcyr whose phone number is 571-270-3224. The examiner can normally reach on M-F 7:30-5:00 PM EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are not successful, his supervisor, Brian Pendleton, can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, dial 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jean Duclos Saintcyr

/Brian T. Pendleton/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623